## **INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone of July 20, 2004. During the interview applicants previous attorney elected, with traverse, to prosecute the claims of Group I, as defined in the Office Action. As a result, claim 37 is withdrawn from consideration as it is drawn to a non-elected invention.

#### REMARKS

Claims 27-36 and 38 were presented for examination. The Office Action rejects claims 27-36, and 38. This response amends claims 27 and 31-36. Applicants submit that the amendments overcome the rejections and respectfully request that they be withdrawn. Claims 27-36 and 38 remain pending in the application.

Applicants are filing this amendment and response within the shortened statutory period. Therefore no fee is due with this filing; however, if a fee is due please charge Deposit Account No. 502295.

## Rejection of claims 27-36 under U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects claims 27-36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained against the claims as amended.

Applicants herein amends claim 27 in the manner suggested by the Office Action. Claim 27, as amended, recites a method of forming micro-mirror structures that includes a reference to a mirror as part of the structure. In addition, applicants herein amend claims 31-36 to address antecedent basis concerns raised by the Office Action and the amendment to claim 27.

Applicants submit that the claims as amended particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regards as the invention. As such, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 27-36 under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

# Rejection of claim 38 under U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action rejects claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hornbeck (U.S. Patent No. 5,583,688). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Hornbeck is directed to a digital micro-mirror device. "The tip of the hinge yoke is constructed to land on M3, as shown in FIG. 3c, before the mirror contacts the address electrode." See column 4, lines 21-23. "Prior art DMD designs typically landed on the tip of the mirror instead of a hinge yoke." See column 4, lines 24-26. When constructed as an array of micro-mirror devices, "each element of the array is a square mirror fabricated on 17 μm centers with a gap between mirrors of approximately 1 μm" (emphasis added). See column 3, lines 46-48.

Claim 38, as amended, recites in pertinent part "dams disposed between the two-dimensional mirrors to block viscous interaction between ... the two-dimensional mirrors." The dams of applicants' invention are shown for example in FIGS. 8A-8C, and described in detail for example in applicants' specification at page 15, line 12 through page 16, line 11. Although Hornbeck discloses gaps between mirrors, Hornbeck does not also disclose the additional structure of dams disposed between the mirrors as recited in applicants' claim 38.

For at least this reason, Hornbeck fails to disclose or suggest all the elements of applicants' independent claim 38, as amended. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 38.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the arguments made herein, applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003 ext. 13.

Date: October 26, 2004

Reg. No. 50,749

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003 ext. 13

5083030005

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

Respectfully, submitted,

Attorncy for Applicants Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP 5 Mount Royal Avenue Marlborough, MA 01752